Mr. Javed Ahmad Ghamidi vs. Ali Sina Part 15

Dr. Javed Ahmad Ghamidi and Dr. Khalid Zaheer vs. Ali Sina

Part IX

Dr. Zaheer wrote:

> 4) I would now like to tell you briefly what I think is the correct approach in rationally understanding the issue of the killing of human beings that took place during the prophet's time and the plurality of his wives.
>
> One thing that a reader of the Qur'an cannot miss is the fact that taking a human life has been condemned in it as one of the biggest crimes. "… whoever killed a human being, except as a punishment for murder or for sedition in the earth should be looked upon as though he had killed all mankind. And whoever saved a human it is though he had saved all mankind." (Qur'an; 5:32) If the Qur'an announced this fact on the one hand and the one who presented the book as God's message was Himself frequently committing the very same crime on the other, then the allegation against him shouldn't just be that he took many lives, it should also, in that case, be an allegation of openly violating his own stated principles. It would mean that the presenter of the following message was himself guilty of violating it: "Believers, why do you say something you don't do; the fact that you say what you don't do annoys God greatly." (Qur'an; 61:2) Moreover, the implication of it would be that those who followed the presenter of such a message were all extremely naïve. Could that be true or is it that the critics are missing an important point? Likewise, the Qur'an condemns committing zina (the act of extra-marital sex) as one of the three biggest crimes -- third only to polytheism and murder -- in the eyes of God. If you are accusing the presenter of Islam of committing that very act, your allegation is even more serious than it is considered for an ordinary person who commits it.

Greetings to both of you Dr. Ghamidi and Dr. Zaheer:

This is my response to the rest of your last letter. It became too long and I decided to divide it in four parts. The first part was part VIII, the rest comes in part IX, X, and XI.

Muhammad on many instances did things that not only were against the universally acclaimed ethical principles, even by the society in which he lived, but he also went against his own stated rules. He basically did whatever he pleased and when that shocked his followers he brought a verse from his imaginary Allah to justify his actions and silence any critic. With a verse under his belt, anyone whispering a word against his indecency, was denying God and of course , as a denier of God his situation was clear. That was *faslul-khitab* (the end of discussion) Examples abound. Here are a few:

The Qur'an limits four wives for the believers. However Muhammad thought that he should not be restricted by his own rules and therefore made his Allah reveal the verse 33:49-50 telling him that he is exempt and can have any number of women, as wives, concubines, slaves or "gifts" (habba) as he pleases. Then he added "This only for you, [O Muhammad] and not for the Believers (at large)¼in order that there should be no difficulty for you. And Allâh is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful."

What difficulty? The difficulty of having to control his lustfulness, of being a decent human being, faithful to one woman! Are we to believe in a man who found it difficult to control his basest animal instincts as the "best of creation?" Don't actions speak louder than words? On one hand he lived like the vilest beats and on the other hand he spoke of himself so loftily putting words in the mouth of the Almighty to praise him. Remember that while still in Mecca, living off the wealth of his wife, Muhammad did not dare to bring another woman to the house of Khadijah. All his sexual vagaries started when he came to power. Are we to believe that as a young and virile man he did not have difficulty sleeping with an older woman and his difficulties appeared in the last ten years of his life that he was old and beset by all sorts of ailments? Or shall we interpret this as another sign of an aging man gone wild with his newfound liberties and like a child, left unchecked in a candy store, was unable to set the limits?

One day Muhammad visited his wife Hafsa, daughter of Umar and upon meeting her maid Mariyah, he lusted for her. He sent Hafsa for an errand telling her a lie that her father wanted to talk to her. When she went out of the door he took Mariyah to the bed of Hafsa and had sex with her. Hafsa came back when her father told her that he had not sent after her and found what was going on and why Muhammad wanted to get rid of her. Hafsa became upset and started to make a scene. (Ah! Women will be always women!) To pacify her, Muhammad promised to prohibit Mariyah to himself. (Hence the name of the sura Tahrim) However, he still lusted after her. How could he now break his own oath? Well, that is easy when you have a god in your sleeve. So his god revealed sura Tahrim and told him it is okay to break his oath and have sex with that slave girl who is lawful to him. Actually the maker of the universe acting as a pimp was angry at Muhammad and even rebuked him for denying the carnal pleasures to himself and for promising to be decent once in his lifetime, just to please his wives. 66:1-5.

> O Prophet! Why do you ban (for yourself) that which Allâh has made lawful to you, seeking to please your wives? And Allâh is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful.
> Allâh has already ordained for you (O men), the dissolution of your oaths. And Allâh is your Maula (Lord, or Master, or Protector, etc.) and He is the All-Knower, the All-Wise.

How nice!

Ibn Sa'd writes: "Abu Bakr has narrated that the messenger of Allâh (PBUH) had sexual intercourse with Mariyah in the house of Hafsa. When the messenger came out of the house, Hafsa was sitting at the gate (behind the locked door). She told the prophet, O Messenger of Allâh, do you do this in my house and during my turn? The Prophet said,

control yourself and let me go for I make her haram to me. Hafsa said, I do not accept, unless you swear for me. That Hazrat (his holiness) said, by Allâh I will not touch her again."1

(https://www.faithfreedom.org/debates/Ghamidip14.htm#_ftn1)

As usual, Muslims have justified Muhammad for the breach of his oath. It does not matter what Muhammad did. Muslims will always justify his actions. They have submitted their intelligence to him and have stopped thinking. Ibn Sa'd continues: "Qasim ibn Muhammad has said that this promise of the Prophet that had forbidden Mariyah to himself is invalid – it does not become a violation (*hormat*).2

(https://www.faithfreedom.org/debates/Ghamidip14.htm#_ftn2)

The question is that if his oath had no validity, why he made it and if it was valid, why he broke it? There are countless other examples that Muhammad broke his own promise. Here, he had sworn to God and not even that was an impediment to him. His god was a figment of his own imagination and he was not that stupid to let his imagination stop him from having sex with the beautiful Mariyah. The whole idea of inventing that god was to approve whatever he desired and not to lay restrictions on him.

One day Muhammad went to see his adopted son Zeid and there he saw his wife Zainab, in her revealing home clothing. He was aroused by her beauty and could not control his desire. When Zeid learned this, he felt obliged to divorce his wife so Muhammad could have her. Now, it is interesting that a few years earlier, when Muhammad claimed to have ascended to heaven, he said that there he met a woman. He asked about her, they said she is Zainab, the wife of Zeid. (Somewhat anachronistic; but, hey, it's Muhammad heaven made by his wild imagination. So time can be backward or forward in heaven) Later he told this story to Zeid who thinking that his marriage has been arranged in heaven married her. However, when Muhammad saw her semi nude, he forgot all about his own heavenly story. Of course. no one better than him knew that the whole story of Mi'raj (ascension) was his own fabrication.

His marriage to Zeinab, his own daughter in law, confounded even his followers who were by all means low in intelligence, as generally they are today. To silence them, his Allah came out of his sleeve with a verse saying Muhammad is not the father of anyone but the messenger of Allah and the last prophet. He claimed that his marriage to Zeinab was arranged by God to show people that adoption is a bad thing and it should be annulled. As you can see, just because he could not control his lust, he made his bogus deity tell people that adoption is wrong and thus deprived countless orphans of having a second chance at life. Doesn't this alone disqualify him as a messenger of God? How can the Almighty be offended by adoption, which is perhaps one of the most humane and lofty human institutions? Is Allah really the Almighty, or is he Satan?

Muhammad reintroduced the pagan tradition of fasting during the month of Ramadan. However he found it difficult to abstain from food and water, from dawn to dusk, so he ate

whenever he pleased. Ibn Sa'd writes: "The Messenger of Allâh used to say 'We the prophets are required to eat our morning food later than others and hurry in breaking our fast in the evening.'"3

(https://www.faithfreedom.org/debates/Ghamidip14.htm#_ftn3)

These are just a few examples of how Muhammad did as he pleased and made his Allah approve whatever he did. The young and perceptive Aisha noticed this and perhaps sarcastically, or innocently, said to him "I feel that your Lord hastens in fulfilling your wishes and desires."4

(https://www.faithfreedom.org/debates/Ghamidip14.htm#_ftn4)

..

As for the verse 5:32 that says whoever kills one person is as if he has killed all mankind, please note that this verse has nothing to do with the teachings of Muhammad. Here Muhammad is rehashing the Biblical tale of Cain killing Abel and this verse is part of the Judaic scriptures. The logic of this nonsensical statement is that according to the mythology, Abel and Cain were the progenitors of all mankind and by killing one of them; his potential offspring would not have had the chance to be born. This is fairytale. The evolution explains things differently and this Judaic explanation that Muhammad has plagiarized now seems absurd.

Muhammad rehashed a lot of Biblical narratives. You don't kill all mankind if you kill one person. If you kill one person you have killed one person and if you kill two you have killed two, and so on. The verse makes only sense in the Biblical context that it was written and it is only a fable.

Why Muslims are so fond of using this Judaic fable as part of Muhammad's sayings? It is because there is so little good in the Quran that they can brag about.

Before I respond to these allegations, let me clarify that despite considering the acts of taking somebody's life and having sex with women as criminal, all (or almost all) civilized societies have devised rules that allow the same very acts as legitimate within the limits allowed by those rules. For instance, murder is a crime, but most societies don't consider it a crime if a person who has himself been declared guilty of murder by a court of law and therefore deserving capital punishment is killed. If an individual who is championing the cause of human rights declares that the state where capital punishment was awarded to the criminals guilty of murder was a criminal state, he is moving beyond his limits in doing so. And if he starts using foul language against such a state because that state doesn't agree with his point of view on capital punishment, he is not only uncivilized, he is also guilty of misguiding people by using emotional rhetoric. Indeed, he has a right to dispute intellectually that a murderer, despite being a criminal, should not be killed. Likewise, the other group can continue to claim that the killer deserves to be killed. However, by moving outside the domain of intellectual debate and making one-sided conclusions, if the person starts using his website, for instance, to call such a state criminal and its rulers, monsters, it would reasonable to conclude that there is likely to be something seriously wrong with his mental balance and the readers of his site should be made aware of it.

My erudite friends: I am afraid you are using a wrong analogy. The argument that in some countries capital punishment by death is still practiced is actually a red herring. Here we are not talking about the punishment of murderers but the persecution and killing of innocent people who want to have freedom of belief. You must really underestimate the intelligence of your readers by presenting this as an argument. No civilized society would allow killing people who think differently. In fact in all civilized societies those who dissent with the ruling faction form their own opposition parties and openly criticize them. Their rights are protected under the law. Not only they are allowed to criticize the governing rulers, every four years or so, they are given the chance to topple them in a general election. In civilized societies your rights as an individual are protected and you are free to express your views openly. You can criticize anyone and anything in liberty. There are no hold bars! Nothing is sacrosanct. You can criticize political ideologies, religions or even God. That is why free societies progress. Progress is the result of freedom of thought. Where thoughts are stifled, censored and banned, progress is stifled, censored and banned.

Islam claims to be a religion that wants to rule the world. In other words it is political and wants to have absolute control over every aspect of the lives of all the inhabitants of the Earth, whether Muslims or not, and at the same time it does not tolerate criticism and wants to put to death those who do so. As such it is an impediment to freedom, progress and the expansion of knowledge. It would be insane to let this totalitarian doctrine come to power. We must fight it tooth and nail and be prepared to respond to its aggression with force. Freedom is not free. Those who take their freedom for granted will lose it. The advance of Islam must be stopped at all levels. Since Islam is not just a religion but a totalitarian political ideology, it is the responsibility of political parties and the governments to fight against it.

Despots cannot tolerate dissent. Saddam Hussein is reported to have called his generals only weeks after he had usurped the power and after stating that he had been informed about an impending coupe against him, he took his revolver out and shot a number of them on the spot. No trial was needed and no guilt had to be established. Mere suspicion of opposition to him was enough to kill any number of people. He massacred entire populations simply because a group of them were dissidents. This kind of behavior is the hallmark of the governance of all despots such as Hitler, Stalin, Mao Ze Dong, Pol Pot, Idi Amin and Khomeini. These men were monsters. There is nothing wrong with the mental balance of those who call them with that name. In fact one should question the wisdom of anyone who is unable to see anything wrong in these evil men or worse, believes that they were worthy of praise.

Muhammad ruled in the same fashion that these monsters did. You do not disagree with that but what sets him apart, according to you, is that he was justified to rape and murder because he received his orders from God and as such you are not willing to judge him. This is a big hurdle for you to overcome. You must first tell us why God, instructed his prophet to act like the worst criminals of history? This, for sure, baffles people and any rational person, familiar with what Muhammad did, is impelled to believe that he was a psychopath criminal.

This is a major blunder on the part of Allah. By licensing his prophet to act like a gangster he has made it impossible for good humans to believe. Two kinds of people can believe in such a man, a) those who see nothing wrong in rape, looting and murder of innocent people and b) those that although know these actions are wrong are so brainwashed that are unable to think rationally and they condone whatever Muhammad did blindly. Rational and decent people will always be aghast when they read the tales of murders, assassinations, rapes and lootings committed by Muhammad and his companions. Not everyone is able or willing to fool himself with the story that God ordered his messenger to act like a beast. Would you follow a man that did what Muhammad did if his name was Charles, David or Jim? You certainly won't. Why then when it comes to Muhammad you abandon rationality and become willing to close your eyes to his crimes? Isn't this the most important decision of your life? Shouldn't you use everything at your possession, particularly your rational ability to make sure that you are not following a wrong path into hell? What kind of people Allah wants to pick as his own – criminals and brainwashed zombies or decent humans? If the latter, why his messenger did not act in a decent way, to attract decent people? Assuming there is a day in which you have to appear in front of your maker, what would you tell him if he asks you "why did you not look at the actions of Muhammad? Wasn't that enough proof that this man was an impostor, liar and deceiver? Didn't I give you a brain? Why did you not use it?" Do you have a good answer to this question? Are you sure you can fool God with silly alibis such as, "I was so afraid to doubt that buried my intelligence under piles of falsehoods and wishful thinking and refused to think?" Will you be able to say I saw something out of this word in him? What would you do if He tells you that you have been deceived by Satan and that you should have judged him by his fruits?

God gave us humans the rational faculty to distinguish between right and wrong, to choose the good and to shun the evil. It is unbefitting for God to send a messenger that does evil things and then expect us to overlook all that and still believe. The rules of God are consistent. See how nature works! The laws of physics don't change and they are predictable. That is why we know they are not made by a whimsical capricious god. God will not trick us. How can we know a claimant is from God and not an impostor if not by evaluating the consistency of his actions and words?

God warned us against Satan. Jesus, whom you believe to be a true messenger of God, warned people to watch for false prophets. When asked how to recognize them, he replied, by their fruits. The fruits of Muhammad are all bitter and poisonous. Yet, you tell us that since he was a messenger of God, it is not up to us humans to judge him by his fruits? Doesn't this belie what Jesus said? If what you say is true, Jesus was a liar. He fooled us. He should have said, follow the one whose actions are most despicable, who sheds the blood of innocent people for only disagreeing with him, who from rags comes to riches by robbing caravans and by looting villages and towns, who raids nomads and villagers with no warning and cowardly kills their unarmed men then takes their wives and children as slaves and rapes any woman that he pleases, for he is indeed the true messenger of God.

Tell us Dr. Ghamidi and Dr. Zaheer: why God plays these kinds of tricks? Why he wants to deceive humans and instead of sending a holy man he sends one whose actions are indistinguishable from other contemptible monsters of history to guide us to the right path? Isn't it God's fault for misleading us? No, it is not God's fault. The only correct answer is that Muhammad was an impostor. God warned us against him. All we have to do is listen to what Jesus said and we would know Muhammad was a false prophet. We can recognize this impostor by his fruits. The writings are on the wall. If you choose to close your eyes and not see, you have no one to blame but yourself. If there is a Day of Reckoning, you must answer to your creator for the wrong path that you choose today. The evidence against Muhammad is overwhelming. You have no excuse. For surety the excuse that I followed the majority is not going to be accepted and you know that.

Muhammad claimed to have sublime morals (Q.68:4), to be a good example to follow (Q.33:21), a mercy for all creatures (Q.21:107), an honorable messenger (Q.81:19). He bragged a lot about himself. Are any of these claims true? If not then he lied and he cannot be the prophet of God. Would an honorable person have sex with the wife of another man after capturing her in a raid? Is having sex with an 8 years 9 months old child a good example to follow? If today anyone does what Muhammad did he will be taken to prison and perhaps locked for good. "Honorable?" "Good example?" This is how narcissists describe themselves. This is the image Hitler, Stalin, Mao, Pol Pot and Saddam, tried to portray of themselves. While they were the vilest creatures, they claimed to be better than anyone else and killed any person who disagreed. How can intelligent men such as your good selves overlook all these evidence and still believe in such a man?

As a child my mom told me a story about Muhammad that I have not yet read in any reliable source. She said that one day a woman complained to Muhammad that her little son was

eating too much dates and she requested that he tell the boy not to. Muhammad told her, to come back the next day. When the next day she came, he told the little boy not to eat too much dates. The mother was surprised and asked why you did not say this yesterday? Muhammad replied, because yesterday, I was eating dates myself and I could not tell the boy not to do what I myself was doing. Now, this is a nice story, the kinds of stories parents tell their children to make them love Muhammad. It is however apocryphal, or if true, it was only Muhammad's way to feign piety to fool the gullible. Muslims are taken in by these silly and often false tales. The truth is that Muhammad's words and deeds were very different. He prohibited killing with his mouth but he killed thousands of innocent people because they were not swayed by his lies. As a narcissist he could not tolerate dissent and thought might is right. He told others to be kind to orphans, when in practice he orphaned thousands. He prohibited stealing but he robbed caravans and looted many towns and villages. How did he accumulate his immense wealth? Wasn't everything he owned, spoils from his raids? Was that also an order of Allah? Why Allah needed the possession of a bunch of Arabs? How much shall we fool ourselves? He tortured to death, Kinana, the young husband of Safiyah, whom he took to his tent that very night and had sex with, to make him reveal the whereabouts of the treasures of the Khaibar. Was that also ordered by God? Couldn't this god who was fast to reveal a verse to justify his prophet's sexual vagaries and meet his every needs, tell him the whereabouts of the treasures and save that poor soul from torture? He prohibited sex out of wedlock but he prescribed and practiced rape of women captured in war. In other words sex between two consenting adults was a sin punishable by stoning but rapping a captive woman was good and dandy.

How can any person believe in this monster? Where is Muslims' conscience? Sadly, blind faith takes away our humanity. These things will make any decent person cringe but I know that they make no dent in the faith of the believers. Why? It is because they have submitted their intelligence to Muhammad. And you tell me Islam is rational? Not everything Muhammad said is wrong. There are also some true statements that were said by many before him. One such statements is the verse 8:22 that you quoted. "Indeed the worst beasts in the eyes of God are those men who are deaf, dumb, and blind in that they don't use their intellect."

..

I know nothing can change the mind of one whose mind is set and nothing will wake up one who does not want to wake up. I have a different strategy to help Muslims. I am making these facts known to the non-Muslim world and urge them to spread it for their own good and the good of their children. Let the entire world know the truth about Islam. If what I say is not the truth, tell us the truth. I will publish whatever you write.

I know how much Muslims care about their image. I know a thing or two about narcissistic personality disorder. This was the disorder of Hitler, Saddam, Stalin, and also Muhammad. Consequently all those who have entered in his bubble universe and try to emulate him are also affected by it just as all those who followed these other monsters acted evil and murdered their fellow countrymen.

The narcissist is mostly concerned about his image. Once their image is soiled worldwide, Muslims will be so humiliated and shamed that they will have no choice but to get serious and come to their senses. Islam must be attacked from every direction. One front of this war is psychological warfare. Muslims are filled with vain glory and false pride. This pride must be crushed with humiliation, derision and public condemnation. When the truth about Islam is spread, Muslims will feel embarrassed of that name and this is the beginning of the end of Islam and their ticket to freedom and enlightenment. We will be victorious because in a confrontation between truth and falsehood truth will always win.

> Likewise, a case can be made of having sex with women. All decent societies agree that the very same act of physical relationship between a man and a woman which is otherwise condemnable is perfectly acceptable if the couple is married. The Western society has already reached a stage where it is not considered reprehensible if a couple is cohabiting with mutual consent and they are living like husband and wife, making a commitment that they will remain loyal to each other, even though they haven't formally solemnized their marriage in a church or some other officially designated place by making public pronouncement of their relationship. Now, if I were to criticize such an act, I should criticize the basic principle underlying that arrangement, rather than go about condemning as people guilty of fornication those men and women who are thus living together. If I will do that and run a website where every now and then I write articles using filthy language to condemn such people, I will be behaving like an idiot who has gone out of his senses. Similarly, a society has a right to disagree with the concept of polygamy, but it has no right to declare a man with two wives a criminal who belongs to another society when polygamy is an acceptable arrangement in his society.

Again, you are engaging in the fallacy of wrong analogy. Yes, polygamy is barbaric and it must be outlawed. A society that does not grant equal rights to its women is an unjust society. Inequality of rights is at the core of polygamy. The fact that a society follows a barbaric rule does not make that rule legitimate and tolerable. Slavery is wrong as it has been always. It is absurd to say that if slavery is legal in a country, that country must be respected and not criticized. This argument comes from the same mentality that thinks might is right. It would be idiotic to tolerate slavery just because it is the law of a country. The same can be said about polygamy. Polygamy should be banned and countries that practice it must be denounced and kicked out of the community of civilized nations. Polygamy is abuse of human rights; it has no place in the civilized world.

In free and democratic societies a man and a woman may decide to share their lives together but do not wish to publicly announce their union or register it anywhere. This is their prerogative and it is not up to anyone to put his nose in other people's lives telling them how they should live. Even if a couple does not register their marriage, that union is recognized as "common law" and the couple has the same responsibilities and rights towards each other that married couples have.

However, here we are not talking about polygamy but rape of women captured in war. How can any one follow a man who raped his captives of war? What kind of god would pick such a person to act as his messenger or condone these despicable acts? What Muhammad did and said in the Qur'an in this regard is unconscionable. Polygamy is bad, but rape is quite something else. Having sex with women captured in war is one of the most hideous acts imaginable, especially when their husbands are still alive.

When Pakistani solders invaded Bangladesh (then East Pakistan) in 1971, they raped the women; both Hindus and Muslims, because a Pakistani cleric declared them kafirs. The soldiers of your country massacred 3,000,000 innocent Bangladeshis and raped 250,000 women. How could people do so much evil on such a massive scale? It is because they were Muslims and they did what Muhammad did. There was no pang of conscience and no apology was ever issued. The soldiers saw nothing wrong in what they were doing because they were following their religion just as you see nothing wrong in what Muhammad did. How would you feel if someone does to you and your wife what Muhammad and his gang did to their victims? Is it really difficult to see the evil that Muhammad committed? Is it really difficult to see that Muslims do evil because they follow an evil man?

> One should first know what rules are being followed in a society and then judge the members of that society according to those rules. Of course, one has the right to disagree with those rules. But disagreeing with someone else's principles is one thing and condemning him as criminal for not conforming to one's own principles is quite another. While the former attitude falls in the category of participation in an intellectual debate, the latter belongs to the territory of mild lunacy.

So, in your opinion, those who criticized Hitler, Saddam, Stalin or Pol Pot were lunatic? Muhammad acted in the same way these monsters did. No, my learned friends: An evil practice does not become legit just because it is the law of the land or alleged to be from God. It becomes legit only if it conforms to the Golden Rule. A rule that does not conform to the Golden Rule is not from God. The Golden Rule should be our balance. What you are prescribing is moral relativism. One must not see first what rules are being followed in a society but rather question the validity of those rules in accordance to the Golden Rule and the principle of fairness.

Why should criticizing Muhammad be lunacy? The only answer you gave so far is that he was acting under the direction of Allah. You want to shift all the blame on Allah. Is Allah a psychopath? How could any real God instruct his messenger to behave with so much depravity? Is this what you call rational faith?

You must either claim that whatever Muhammad did was good and therefore cheerfully accept the same to be done to you and your family or denounce his actions as evil and repudiate him. If you don't want to be treated the way Muhammad treated his opponents then what he did was not good. Your alibi that since he was a messenger of God his evil deeds were licensed is illogical and unacceptable. If so, then one can also suspect that

David Koresh and Shoko Asahara were messiahs. Just like Muhammad, they made big claims and like him they lived a vile life. What distinguishes Muhammad from these other sociopaths?

You have not given single evidence to the claim that Muhammad was a messenger of God. You just chose to believe in him and then submitted your intelligence to him. Out of hundreds of errors, absurdities and blunders, I only asked four questions. Are you honestly satisfied with the responses that you gave? There have been many times that out of shear faith I tried to answer to the criticism of Islam and then felt betrayed. I tried to fool others but I could not fool myself. You are smart men - far too intelligent to fool yourselves. Are you happy with your responses? I see that you avoided answering my fourth question altogether.

However, you stated something important, which is the crux of the problem. You said that despite the fact that even you can see part of the Qur'an is unjust and wrong, you have chosen to submit to it unreservedly because you also saw a part of it is "brilliant" and "out of this world." Well, tell us about it. Let us now ask you to lead this discussion. I will no longer ask questions, even thought I have hundreds of them. Let us now see one of those brilliant and out-of-this-world statements in the Qur'an that have swayed you and see if you indeed have stumbled upon something truly magnificent and divine that the rest of us have missed. Or maybe, it's your wishful thinking that is playing tricks on you and you have been misled by your uncritical faith and desire to believe. You say Islam is logical! Okay, bring your proof on. We are eagerly looking forward to hear your undeniable and irrefutable hujjat (evidence).

1

(https://www.faithfreedom.org/debates/Ghamidip14.htm#_ftnref1) *Tabaqat volume 8, page 223*

2

(https://www.faithfreedom.org/debates/Ghamidip14.htm#_ftnref2) Ibid.

3

(https://www.faithfreedom.org/debates/Ghamidip14.htm#_ftnref3) Tabaqat, Volume 1, page 369

4

(https://www.faithfreedom.org/debates/Ghamidip14.htm#_ftnref4) Sahih Al-Bukhari, Volume 6, Book 60, Number 311